

Subject: Re: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 21:19:58 +0000
From: "Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)" <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
To: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>, Saul Japson <saul.japson@gsa.gov>, Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>
Message-ID: <A690F4CC-7CEE-4C91-95B5-0BF91128929D@epw.senate.gov>
MD5: 0fea5b21ea9d26b2ad5e1b87a496dac1

Andrew,

We have received your responses. Thank you very much.

Best,

Elizabeth "Lizzy" Olsen, J.D.
Majority Counsel & Director of Operations
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
C: (b) (6)
O: (202)224-6176

On Jul 31, 2018, at 5:11 PM, Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov> wrote:

Elizabeth,

Please find attached GSA's responses to the QFRs.

Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov


On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW) <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov> wrote:

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: F B I Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

Subject: Re: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 17:10:37 -0400
From: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
To: "Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)" <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>, Saul Japson <saul.japson@gsa.gov>, Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>
Message-ID: <CAFrwOFjq3L2dZ1FDFFhtFxmDwMxDqCCnLRfhB+Z63HNdv1_25g@mail.gmail.com>
MD5: 337b26735bcef4bd40f8e964dc9df202
Attachments: CC038724 GSA QFRs for SenEPW Final (1).pdf 

Elizabeth,

Please find attached GSA's responses to the QFRs.

Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW) <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov> wrote:

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: FBI Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by COB Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the EPW Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

If you have any questions about the request or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at (202) 224-6176 or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at (202) 224-8832.

Sincerely,

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Andrew Blaylock - S** <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Date: Mon, Mar 19, 2018 at 4:08 PM
Subject: Fwd: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
To: Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)** <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
Date: Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM
Subject: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
To: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: FBI Headquarters Consolidation Project.*" The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by COB Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the EPW Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

If you have any questions about the requests or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at [\(202\) 224-6176](tel:(202)224-6176) or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at [\(202\) 224-8832](tel:(202)224-8832).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Andrew Blaylock - S** <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Date: Mon, Mar 19, 2018 at 4:08 PM
Subject: Fwd: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
To: Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)** <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
Date: Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM
Subject: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
To: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: F B I Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by C O B Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the E P W Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D C 20510.

If you have any questions about the requests or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at [\(202\) 224-6176](tel:(202)224-6176) or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at [\(202\) 224-8832](tel:(202)224-8832).

Sincerely,

John Barrasso, M.D.
Chairman

Thomas R. Carper
Ranking

Subject: Re: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 21:19:58 +0000
From: "Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)" <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
To: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>, Saul Japson <saul.japson@gsa.gov>, Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>
Message-ID: <A690F4CC-7CEE-4C91-95B5-0BF91128929D@epw.senate.gov>
MD5: 283b39e3ca161ab41018156f65630698

Andrew,

We have received your responses. Thank you very much.

Best,

Elizabeth "Lizzy" Olsen, J.D.
Majority Counsel & Director of Operations
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
C: (b) (6)
O: [202224-6176](tel:2022246176)

On Jul 31, 2018, at 5:11 PM, Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov> wrote:

Elizabeth,

Please find attached GSA's responses to the QFRs.

Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Blaylock
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW) <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov> wrote:

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: FBI Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by COB Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the EPW Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

If you have any questions about the requests or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at (202) 224-6176 or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at (202) 224-8832.

Sincerely,

John Barrasso, M.D.

Chairman
Member

Thomas R. Carper

Ranking

Elizabeth "Lizzy" Olsen, J.D.


Majority Counsel & Director of Operations

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works

C: (b) (6)

O: (202)224-6176

<CC038724 GSA QFRs for SenEPW Final (1).pdf>

Subject: Re: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 17:10:37 -0400
From: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
To: "Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)" <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>, Saul Japson <saul.japson@gsa.gov>, Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>
Message-ID: <CAFrwOFjq3L2dZ1FDFFhtFxmDwMxDqCCnLRfhB+Z63HNdv1_25g@mail.gmail.com>
MD5: 4bd101186fcb6384e841094f76f37376
Attachments: CC038724 GSA QFRs for SenEPW Final (1).pdf 

Elizabeth,

Please find attached GSA's responses to the QFRs.

Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW) <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov> wrote:

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: F B I Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by C O B Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the E P W Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D C 20510.

If you have any questions about the requests or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at (202) 224-6176 or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at (202) 224-8832.

Sincerely,

Subject: Re: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 21:19:58 +0000
From: "Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)" <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
To: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>, Saul Japson <saul.japson@gsa.gov>, Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>
Message-ID: <A690F4CC-7CEE-4C91-95B5-0BF91128929D@epw.senate.gov>
MD5: b0d22f4117f218cdc9f10abb6907921e

Andrew,

We have received your responses. Thank you very much.

Best,

Elizabeth "Lizzy" Olsen, J.D.
Majority Counsel & Director of Operations
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
C: (b) (6)
O: (202)224-6176

On Jul 31, 2018, at 5:11 PM, Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov> wrote:

Elizabeth,

Please find attached GSA's responses to the QFRs.

Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW) <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov> wrote:

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: F B I Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth.Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by C O B Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the E P W Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D C 20510.

If you have any questions about the requests or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at (202) 224-6176 or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at (202) 224-8832.


Sincerely,

John Barrasso, M.D.
Chairman
Member

Thomas R. Carper
Ranking

Elizabeth "Lizzy" Olsen, J.D.
Majority Counsel & Director of Operations
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
C: (b) (6)
O: (202)224-6176

<CC038724 GSA QFRs for SenEPW Final (1).pdf>

Subject: Re: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works: Hearing Follow Up Questions, Commissioner Matthews
Date: Tue, 31 Jul 2018 17:10:37 -0400
From: Andrew Blaylock - S <andrew.blaylock@gsa.gov>
To: "Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW)" <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov>
Cc: "Willson, James (EPW)" <James_Willson@epw.senate.gov>, Saul Japson <saul.japson@gsa.gov>, Jessica Jennings - S <jessica.jennings@gsa.gov>
Message-ID: <CAFrwOFjq3L2dZ1FDFFhtFxmDwMxDqCCnLRfhB+Z63HNdv1_25g@mail.gmail.com>
MD5: 0881ae978636263f7807072e55024ade
Attachments: CC038724 GSA QFRs for SenEPW Final (1).pdf 

Elizabeth,

Please find attached GSA's responses to the QFRs.

Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Blaylock

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. General Services Administration
1800 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
Office: 202.969.7189
Email: Andrew.Blaylock@gsa.gov

On Thu, Mar 15, 2018 at 5:38 PM, Olsen, Elizabeth (EPW) <Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov> wrote:

March 15, 2018

Dan Mathews
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
1800 F St. NW
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Commissioner Matthews:

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we would like to thank you for testifying before the Committee on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at the hearing entitled, "*Oversight: F B I Headquarters Consolidation Project*." The Committee greatly appreciates your attendance and participation in this hearing.

In order to maximize the opportunity for communication between you and the Committee, follow-up questions have been submitted by the members. To comply with Committee rules, please e-mail a copy of your responses to Elizabeth_Olsen@epw.senate.gov or deliver one hard copy by C O B Wednesday, March 28, 2018. Responses should be delivered to the E P W Committee at 410 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D C 20510.

If you have any questions about the requests or the hearing, please feel free to contact Staff Director, Richard Russell in the Majority Office at (202) 224-6176 or Staff Director, Gabrielle Batkin in the Minority Office at (202) 224-8832.

Sincerely,

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
“Oversight: FBI Headquarters Consolidation Project.”
February 28, 2018

Questions for the Record for Commissioner Dan Mathews, GSA

Chairman Barrasso:

1. Last July, news of GSA’s decision to cancel its procurement process first broke through various media outlets the day before the agency gave any official notice to Congressional staff. Likewise, GSA’s new plan to keep FBI Headquarters at its current location found its way to reporters two whole weeks before Congress was notified. This is an unacceptable pattern of practice that undermines this Committee’s oversight authority. What can GSA do to remedy this issue moving forward?

The release of this information was not initiated or condoned by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). GSA will continue to stress with all Executive Branch employees the need to manage project-related information appropriately.

2. GSA is requesting \$2.175 billion in additional appropriated funds for this project. This is the largest request throughout the course of this project. Does GSA expect all of this money to be appropriated at the start of the project? If so, what does GSA plan to do if Congress is unable to provide full funding at the start of the project?

GSA and U.S. Department of Justice - Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) are requesting all the funds needed for the construction of the new facility prior to the award of this contract. The need for FBI to have a modern, secure headquarters will remain should funding not be provided.

3. This project has been ongoing since 2004, and it has been seven years since this Committee authorized GSA to act. Since that time, GSA has spent \$20 million in taxpayer money on ideas and plans. It now appears these concepts have been scrapped. Will the taxpayer get any return for the \$20 million spent to date?

GSA and FBI will complete the required due diligence associated with this project by utilizing as much of the prior work as possible. GSA and FBI anticipate that the requirements and procurement documents for the new facility will use a substantial portion of the Program of Requirements developed to date, as well as portions of the previous Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Request for Proposals.

4. How is this revised plan an improvement over the flawed proposals previously brought before this Committee?

The proposed plan allows FBI to consolidate 8,300 personnel on a Government-owned site, with the necessary transportation and utility infrastructure already present, that allows FBI to carry-out its critical law enforcement and national security missions. The

proposed procurement approach eliminates the uncertainties created by the previously proposed exchange construct, and provides for the faster delivery of this much needed facility.

Senator Cardin:

5. Both the GSA and the FBI have consistently told Congress that the FBI must have a fully consolidated headquarters on a campus with ISC Level V security but the JEH site can provide neither full consolidation nor ISV Level V security. How did the “requirements” change so suddenly? Why have you changed the notion of consolidation?

Following the cancellation of the previous procurement last summer in July 2017, GSA and FBI worked together to reduce project costs, review alternative project sites and evaluate a variety of different acquisition strategies. This effort resulted in FBI modifying its Program of Requirements which, in turn, allowed for reutilization of the J. Edgar Hoover (JEH) site. The challenges and cost of constructing a new facility while FBI personnel remained at this site led to the recommendation to demolish and replace the facility with a new headquarters. GSA and FBI believe this recommendation will provide FBI the headquarters it needs to accomplish its critical law enforcement and national security missions.

6. GSA and FBI were consistent in their position that building a replacement FBI headquarters on the site of the current JEH building was not an option because it could not achieve ISC Level V security. Have the FBI’s security needs changed? Has the threat level decreased?

Questions regarding the FBI’s security needs should be referred to the FBI. GSA and FBI are confident that the current plan to construct a replacement headquarters facility on the current JEH site will meet all of FBI’s security needs.

7. Who in the Executive Branch was involved in the July, 2017 decision to cancel the original procurement? Were there any conversations with anyone from the Executive Office of the President? Is so, please state with whom, when and the reason for the conversation.

GSA, in consultation with FBI, made the decision and subsequently notified the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

8. Who in the Executive Branch was involved in the development of the plan which was submitted to the Environment and Public Works Committee on February 12, 2018? Were there any conversations with anyone from the Executive Office of the President? Is so, please state with whom, when and the reason for the conversation.

GSA, FBI, and OMB developed the plan submitted to the Environment and Public Works Committee on February 12, 2018. Briefings were made to appropriate White House officials.

9. According to GSA's site selection guide, site selections are made by balancing the initial cost of the real estate with the goals of the organization, the functioning of the organization, the overall cost of executing the project, security impacts to the organization, the cost of operating the facility, the benefit to the local community and the environment. Where is the analysis of the JEH site? Can you provide the Committee with a copy of that analysis?

As the selected site is already owned by the Government and controlled by GSA, GSA did not undertake a formal site selection analysis when developing the February 12, 2018 plan. Many of the items presented in the Question 9 are addressed in the February plan.

10. How many of the 2,300 people whose jobs are being planned to relocate are expected to move to keep their jobs? Where do those 2,300 employees currently live (by State)?

GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to FBI.

11. What percentage of the 2,300 employees whose jobs are being planned to relocate will be offered Relocation Incentives? Has the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act been applied to the estimated cost to relocate employees to other parts of the country?

GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to FBI.

12. How will the procurement for the design and construction be run? Will one company do both?

GSA has not finalized the selected design and construction strategy. A design/build solution, where a single firm would design and construct the new facility, is an option.

13. Will GSA use the P-100 guide for federal construction? Does the FBI have a design guide, and if so, have the features of the guide been incorporated into the overall cost estimating for the new facility?

Yes, GSA will use its "Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service" (GSA P-100) for this project. GSA is not aware of a similar FBI document.

14. Are you aware of any discussions about or with potential developers? How will you ensure competition? Were there any conversations with anyone from the Executive Office of the President? If so, please state with whom, when and the reason for the conversation.

GSA has had no such discussions with potential developers. As with similar GSA procurements, GSA will comply with all applicable notice and competition requirements, and otherwise ensure that all interested firms wishing to participate in this project have the opportunity to do so. Providing full funding for the project, thereby reducing the uncertainties surrounding this effort, will assist GSA in maximizing competition.

15. How much money will it cost to expand existing facilities in Alabama to accommodate the relocation of staff? How will these costs be financed and what Congressional approval will be needed?

The facilities in question are not in GSA's custody or control nor is GSA performing the work for the FBI; therefore, GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to FBI.

16. How much money will it cost to expand existing facilities in West Virginia to accommodate the relocation of staff? How will these costs be financed and what Congressional approval will be needed?

The facilities in question are not in GSA's custody or control nor is GSA performing the work for the FBI; therefore, GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to FBI.

17. How much money will it cost to expand existing facilities in Idaho to accommodate the relocation of staff? How will these costs be financed and what Congressional approval will be needed?

The facilities in question are not in GSA's custody or control nor is GSA performing the work for the FBI; therefore, GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to FBI.

18. Will there be a separate request for funds to demolish JEH? How much money will it cost to demolish JEH? How will these costs be financed and what Congressional approval will be needed?

No, the appropriation request associated with the February 12, 2018 plan includes the funds necessary to demolish JEH. The cost estimate for the demolition of the JEH building is approximately \$40 million. GSA and the FBI are working together to draft a new prospectus for the project that will be transmitted to the Committee later this year for review and consideration.

19. The February 12th report says that the JEH rebuild is less expensive because it will cost \$2.175 billion to house 8,300 staff while the original consolidation plan would cost \$2.4 billion for 10,606 staff but the accurate comparison can only be found by looking at the same number of staff in both scenarios. So if the JEH rebuild costs \$2.175 billion for 8,300 staff don't you need to subtract 20% of the staff count and 20% of the costs from the original plan? And wouldn't doing so brings that number down closer to \$1.6 billion? So isn't the real comparison is \$1.6 billion to build a building for 8,300 staff under the original campus-style plan and \$2.175 to build a new building for 8,300 staff on the current Pennsylvania Avenue site?

The \$2.175 billion figure referenced in the question does not correspond to a project cost, rather it represents a total shortfall in appropriations as noted in the Funding Gap Analysis on Page 11 of the FBI Revised Nationally-Focused Consolidation Plan.

The original plan envisioned a facility located in a suburban campus. A suburban campus requires certain elements, such as increased structured parking garages, perimeter security enhancements, a separate visitors center, and a truck screening facility, that are either not required at the Pennsylvania Avenue site or already exist with respect to the JEH site. These program differences create a non-linear relationship by headcount and cost between the two scenarios.

20. The timeline on Page 10 claims occupancy in 2025 which seems extraordinarily optimistic for a demo-re-build scenario. Please provide details including the dates you anticipate to begin and conclude each of the following components: production of requirements for the swing space; production of the advertisement for swing space; publishing the advertisement for swing space; analyzing offers of swing space; securing Congressional authorizations and appropriations for swing space; signing leases for the swing space; fitting out the swing space; moving JEH employees into the swing space; the production of requirements for the HQ building; securing Congressional authorizations and appropriations for the JEH demolition; the EIS process on the JEH site; remediating the JEH site; demolishing JEH; designing the new building; advertising for developers; analyzing developers offers; securing Congressional authorizations and appropriations for construction of the new HQ; construction of the new building; fitting out the new building and moving employees into the new building.

The timeline provided on Page 10 was developed using informed preliminary market research, an understanding of the program, and professional expertise. The timeline is dependent on several factors beyond the control of GSA and FBI, particularly the authorization and funding of the project. The timing of such impacts many of the requested milestones.

21. What will the swing space for current HQ staff cost per year? How many leases will be required and for how long?

The estimated annual cost for swing space to house current headquarters staff is between \$35-\$40 million with the amount determined by the exact amount of square footage leased and the rental rate agreed to in any lease agreement. The cost may be able to be reduced by further leveraging the existing Government-controlled inventory in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. During the time FBI occupies its swing space, it will no longer be responsible for paying rent and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs at the JEH Building, which total approximately \$84 million annually. The expected swing space lease term is five years, and the number of leases is not known at this time.

22. What is the extra cost of hardening the new building to meet the FBI's security needs?

The estimated cost to design and construct the new headquarters, including the referenced hardening, is \$1.93 billion.

23. Is it correct that you will not start the process until the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have authorized the project?

GSA does not intend to award a contract prior to receiving prospectus approvals from GSA's House and Senate authorizing committees.

24. Is it correct that you will not award a bid until full funding for this project has been appropriated by Congress?

Yes.

25. How will the FBI's future space needs be addressed after 2025 when the new HQ is occupied? How is the FBI's post-2025 growth being factored into the design and construction of the new building?

GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to the FBI.

26. GSA's Site Selection Guide notes that the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act and the Federal Urban Land Use Act require GSA to consider local planning efforts in the project development and site selection process. Did GSA involve the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) in the production of the plan for the redevelopment of the JEH site? Is GSA aware that in January, 2017 the NCPC published commercial redevelopment plans for the JEH site?

GSA has not yet discussed the current approach with NCPC. GSA is aware of the current Square Guidelines.

27. What conversations have taken place with the District of Columbia regarding the reuse of the JEH site? Did you seek the Mayor's input before recommending the rebuilding of the FBI HQ on the JEH site?

GSA has not had conversations with the Washington, D.C. government about reuse of JEH. GSA has not yet discussed the current approach with the Mayor's office.

Senator Van Hollen:

28. In the letter you sent, dated February 28, 2018, to the Chairman following the hearing (and copied myself and Ranking Member Carper), you clarified your response to my question, "Have you ever had any conversations or communications with the President or any senior White House staff about this FBI project?" In your clarification you stated that you:

Attended one meeting with a senior official at the White House where the primary topic of the meeting was the FBI headquarters project.

Attended one meeting with a senior official at the White House where the FBI headquarters project was discussed briefly as a matter incidental to the subject of the meeting.

Had several meetings with another senior White House official where the FBI headquarters was discussed, but only in the context of a broader discussion of Federal real property acquisition financing.

- a. With respect to meetings referenced in the letter above, please provide detailed information on the date, location, participants, topic, summary and decisions made.

The above-referenced meetings occurred at the White House and the Eisenhower Executive Office Building, between November 2017 and January 2018. No decisions regarding the FBI Headquarters project were made at those meetings. Consistent with established executive branch practices, GSA is not authorized to disclose specific communications with senior White House officials.

- b. With respect to each of those meetings, did any participant indicate the President's views on the FBI headquarters project? If so, what was the nature of those views?

Consistent with established executive branch practices, GSA is not authorized to disclose specific communications with senior White House officials.

- c. Were there any other communications with any other senior staff at the White House or OMB? If so, please provide detailed information for each communication, including the date, location, participants, topic, summary, and decisions made.

Commissioner Mathews had no additional communications with the White House. There were several discussions with OMB officials regarding funding for the FBI headquarters.

- d. With respect to any communications with senior staff at the White House or OMB detailed in the response to the prior question, did any participant indicate the President's views on the FBI headquarters project? If so, what was the nature of those views?

Consistent with established executive branch practices, GSA is not authorized to disclose specific communications with senior White House officials.

- 29. Please provide a fully transparent comparison of the differences in total cost of the new proposed headquarters versus the total estimated cost of building a headquarters based on the February 2016 Prospectus PNCR-FBI-NCR17 submitted to this Committee. This information should include (but is not limited to): cost of demolition of the existing Hoover building, rent for the swing space, cost of continuation of lease payments for

current non-Hoover building employees that have to be continued, and the cost per employee for each location.

Please reference the FBI Revised Nationally-Focused Consolidation Plan. The design and construction cost per employee in a suburban campus scenario with 10,606 employees is approximately \$250,000. In a rebuild scenario at the current JEH site with 8,300 employees, the design and construction cost per employee is approximately \$232,000. The Plan did not include the annual swing space rent.

GSA respectfully defers to FBI on its interim housing needs and costs.

- a. On Page 11 of your proposal, you compare the cost to consolidate 11,000 employees into a campus setting and 8,300 employees into a Hoover Building rebuild. This is comparing apples and oranges. Did GSA and the FBI compare the cost of consolidating 8,300 employees in a Hoover rebuild to consolidating those 8,300 employees at a new location?

The previous plan to consolidate the FBI into a suburban campus was based on a different set of requirements than FBI currently has today. These include, among other things, a reduced headcount from 10,600 to 8,300 and FBI's interest in remaining in close proximity to DOJ.

30. On August 2, 2017 this Committee requested that GSA and FBI return to Congress in 120 days with a plan for the FBI headquarters with a deadline of November 30, 2017. On December 1, 2017 the Committee approved your request for a 60 day extension with a new deadline of January 29, 2018. This second deadline was missed and your revised proposal was submitted on February 12, 2018.

- a. When did you start working on the revised proposal for the FBI headquarters?

August 2017.

- b. Did any senior White House official or the President provide input or make recommendations to GSA or the FBI prior to submission to the White House or OMB for approval?

Briefings were made to appropriate White House officials. GSA did not submit the final proposal, or any drafts, to the White House.

- c. If so, what were those recommendations?

Consistent with established executive branch practices, GSA is not authorized to disclose specific communications with senior White House officials.

- d. When was the proposal sent to the White House and OMB for approval?

GSA sent several draft proposals to OMB, and at a certain point, the proposal became a collaborative effort between GSA, FBI, and OMB. GSA sent the proposal to officials at OMB for final review on February 10, 2018, prior to transmittal to Congress on February 12, 2018. As noted above, GSA did not submit the proposal, or any drafts, to the White House.

- e. Did the President or any senior White House official request or make any changes to the proposal after you submitted it for approval?

As noted above, GSA did not submit the proposal, or any drafts, to the White House.

- f. If so, what were those changes?

As noted above, GSA did not submit the proposal, or any drafts, to the White House.

31. Your proposal states that the, “Two-year budget cap deal provides a unique opportunity to secure appropriations for the FBI headquarters” and in your testimony you stated that the “final recommendation came forward at that same time (as the budget agreement.)” What was GSA and the FBI doing between August 2, 2017 and February 9, 2018 to respond to this committee’s request?

Between August 2, 2017 and February 9, 2018, GSA and FBI were evaluating scope, locations, funding and procurement strategies and developing the submitted presentation.

32. Prior to passage of the budget deal in the early morning hours of February 9, 2018, what was the Administration’s plan for funding the project?

GSA, FBI, and OMB evaluated a number of funding mechanisms for the project.

33. Putting the Hoover building transfer aside, the often stated reason for cancelling the original procurement was due to lack of funding. Now that potential funding is available as a result of the budget deal, did you consider reviving the framework of the original procurement minus the building swap?

The previous procurement framework was developed for an exchange. In removing the exchange, the previous framework is no longer viable.

34. During the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing on February 14, 2018 you stated that the FBI’s role is in defining their mission requirements. When were you notified of the FBI’s revised mission requirements?

GSA was notified of the FBI's reduced headcount in fall 2017 and of the FBI's interest in remaining in its current location in November 2017.

35. After you were informed of the revised mission requirements for the FBI, did you consider any of the other surplus or excess facilities in the GSA portfolio and in the larger government wide portfolio in Washington, DC, Virginia, or Maryland as possible locations or facilities for the headquarters?

Remaining in close proximity to its mission partners has always been an integral part of FBI's housing requirements for its headquarters facility. The reduced size of FBI's program of requirements allowed for the effective re-utilization of the current JEH site. Re-utilization of JEH decreases site acquisition and development costs, precludes the need for local jurisdictions to fund costly off-site transportation improvements, and reduces the Government's costs to construct on-site parking for FBI personnel.

36. If nothing in the GSA inventory or the government-wide inventory met the mission requirements, did GSA review private inventory before deciding on new construction?

Given the highly specialized and unique nature of FBI's headquarters facility, and the strategic importance of FBI's mission, GSA focused on Federally-owned properties to meet FBI's long-term housing requirements for its headquarters facility.

37. What were the steps that you went through before deciding that rebuilding on the Hoover site was the best option?

Remaining in close proximity to its mission partners, at a location such as the existing JEH site, is an integral part of FBI's housing requirements. To that end, GSA analyzed both the upfront and lifecycle costs of renovating the existing JEH facility versus demolishing and rebuilding it. The demolition/rebuild option represents a better value for the taxpayer, and is less disruptive to FBI operations than a renovation.

38. I believe the safety and security of the men and women of the FBI is of utmost importance and I believe that a strong argument can be made that a campus like facility is more secure than the Hoover site in DC. I agree with the GSA Prospectus for Construction (PNCR-FBI-NCR17) that, "The building was designed at a time when FBI operated differently, and *it cannot be redeveloped* to provide the necessary space to consolidate the FBI Headquarters components or to meet the agency's physical security and current and projected operational requirements."

- a. The 2016 Prospectus states that, "The new facility will be built to meet ISC Level V security specifications..." Is it possible to have the same level of security at the Hoover site that was intended for one of the three previously identified sites in MD or VA?

GSA has worked extensively with FBI regarding their facility and operational security requirements, and both agencies are confident that the JEH site can be reutilized in a way that satisfies all of those needs.

- b. Is it possible to achieve ISC Facility Security Level (FSL) V standards for a new building at the Hoover site?

GSA has worked extensively with FBI regarding their facility and operational security requirements, and both agencies are confident that the JEH site can be reutilized in a way that satisfies all of those needs.

39. According to the Interagency Security Committee's document, *The Risk Management Process for Federal Facilities: An Interagency Security Committee Standard* published in November 2016, "Each FSL corresponds to a level of risk that related directly to a Level of Protection (LOP) and associated set of baseline security measures." A level V Facility Security Level has a very high level of risk and required a very high baseline level of protection. Has the GSA ever supported a plan for new construction of a building that is deemed to require an ISC Level V Level of Protection but was built to a lower level of protection?

GSA has worked extensively with FBI regarding their facility and operational security requirements, and both agencies are confident that the JEH site can be reutilized in a way that satisfies all of those needs.

40. According to the FBI, in 1995 when Timothy McVeigh detonated a bomb at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City, "In a matter of seconds, the blast destroyed most of the nine-story concrete and granite building, and the surrounding area looked like a war zone. Dozens of cars were incinerated, and more than 300 nearby buildings were damaged or destroyed."

Knowing this information, and knowing that the FBI headquarters building requires Level V security standards, does the current location of the Hoover building pose any security or other risks to surrounding buildings and structures?

GSA has worked extensively with FBI regarding their facility and operational security requirements, and both agencies are confident that the JEH site can be reutilized in a way that satisfies all of those needs.

41. Has GSA or the FBI consulted with anyone representing Washington, DC Mayor Muriel Bowser or the City Council since the decision was made to cancel the original procurement and the issuance of your new proposal on February 12, 2018?

GSA and FBI met with DC officials on October 18, 2017, following the cancellation of the prior procurement. GSA has not yet discussed the new acquisition approach with the Mayor's office.

42. Has the GSA or FBI consulted with the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) or reviewed and considered the new square guidelines established by the NCPC for the land currently occupied by the Hoover building?

GSA and FBI have not yet consulted with NCPC regarding the current acquisition approach. GSA and FBI have reviewed and considered the current Square Guidelines for the Pennsylvania Avenue site.

43. Please clarify your answer to Ranking Member Carper's question, "When does the GSA anticipate transmitting a new prospectus?"

GSA is working with FBI to draft and transmit a prospectus to Congress later this year.

Senator Whitehouse:

44. Have there been any communications between FBI and GSA and any representative of the Trump Organization about this project? If so, will you disclose them to the Committee?

No, GSA is not aware of any such communications.

45. Can you assure the committee that this change in approach has nothing do to who the President is and the Trump Organization's ownership of a nearby hotel?

Yes.

46. Who directed the cancellation of the Acquisition by Exchange process?

The GSA Contracting Officer made the final decision to cancel the acquisition.

47. Who decided to reconsider the demolish and rebuild strategy that was previously set aside by GSA as too expensive? How have the numbers changed to now make this not only a viable option, but the most cost effective option?

The last time a demolish and rebuild scenario on the JEH site was studied was in 2006, when the FBI headquarters requirement was projected to be 9,528 personnel in 2011. The demolish and rebuild scenario was not viable at that time due to the size of the site not being able to accommodate FBI's mission needs, not necessarily due to cost. Being able to move 2,300 HQ personnel to other Government-owned facilities now makes this proposed strategy viable.

48. Though the proposal from the FBI and GSA estimates the new demolish and rebuild plan will save around \$200 million from the previous suburban consolidation plan, the new plan does not appear to include estimated costs for relocating the 2,300 staff currently in the DC area that will no longer fit in the new building. How much will it cost to move

those people and renovate or build office space for their new assignments in Idaho, West Virginia, or Alabama? Will those costs be paid for by GSA or the FBI?

GSA respectfully requests this question be directed to the FBI.

49. What security upgrades can be made to the current Hoover Building's location that would compare to what could be possible in a suburban campus which has more room for fencing, security checkpoints, and other protective features?

The need for a secured facility that meets the Interagency Security Committee (ISC) Level V standard for the FBI Headquarters remains a priority and is not specific to any location. Due to the urban characteristics of the JEH site, the security strategy will differ from the suburban options included in the prior procurement. The differences include, but are not limited to, construction methodologies and positioning of sensitive operations. The JEH Building, as currently constructed, does not provide the security countermeasures required for an ISC Level V facility. However, these protections can be achieved at the current site with a new facility built with modern technology and appropriate mitigation measures. The ISC process will be utilized to identify and implement the countermeasures required to meet Level V requirements at the JEH Site.